THE UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. JULY 1, 1834. No. 7.

The Meaning of the Text, Matt. xxviii. 19.

"Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

It is the object of this article to inquire what it is to baptize one in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—With most of our readers there may be need of having intelligible ideas on this subject. Accustomed in our earlier years to look upon this text as a proof of a doctrine which inquiry and maturer judgment have led us to reject, a lingering regard for former prejudices may be present in the mind, whenever, in the solemnity of baptism, the phrase, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is repeated. And by many we may be thought to be placed in an unfortunate situation; since, when we would offer either ourselves or our little ones in baptism, we are obliged to repeat a form of expression which is regarded as making against those views of Christianity to which we desire to devote both ourselves and those whose religious education is committed to our hands. An indistinct sense of this we ourselves may have at times felt; and I cannot but think that it has done much to lessen in our minds the significance and interest of the ordinance in question. We shall do well, then, to endeavour to understand the language of our text, to know to whom and to what we are baptized, to comprehend, as nearly as may be, the full and important meaning which our Saviour undoubtedly attached to this last communication and commission to his disciples. We can accomplish all this only by first considering the usage of the times in respect to baptism, and by interpreting our Lord's

language in reference to his prior instructions and to the prospects of his religion.

A mistaken notion is not altogether uncommon, that the idea involved in baptism is that of *dedication.* In baptism it is thought we are *dedicated* to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. But a little consideration will show that this is incorrect. The Jews were accustomed to baptize all who were converts to their religion, and the ceremony was regarded *as a profession of belief.* Thus we read, "Our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all *baptized into Moses* in the cloud and in the sea," i. e. they were not dedicated to Moses, but they professed faith in him. The word is uniformly so used in the New Testament. The believers were all "*batpized into Christ*", into a faith in him. They were "*baptized into one body*", — into belief in, and admission into, one household of believers. They were "*baptized into his death*", — into a belief of his crucifixion. "Were ye *baptized in the name of Paul?*" into a belief in Paul as the master and head of the church. In the last cited instance we have a phrase that occurs in the text, — *in the name of* Paul — *in the name of* the Lord, — a circumlocution of which the Jews were fond, and which was simply an expletive, as "to call on the name of the Lord" is the same as "to call on the Lord." The meaning of the text, then, is, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing into a belief of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

1. "Go and baptize all nations into a belief of the *Father.*"

The God of the Jews was Jehovah, a Being whose name they would not pronounce but with the most mysterious awe, and who, as they thought, made no manifestations of himself, except in rare and peculiar instances, to any but the High Priest in the temple. The Jews thought God was a *vindictive* Being, pursuing with wrath and hatred those who had offended him, and whose kindness and love could be propitiated only by costly rites and sacrifices. The Jews thought God was a *partial* Being, bestowing all care and favour upon the descendants of Abraham, and treating the rest of mankind either as beneath his notice, or as his open enemies. The Jews thought their God entertained and was influenced by human feelings and passions, they imagined that he was pleased with their external cleanness and outward observances, and that he delighted in the incense of the altar and in the blood of the sacrifices. The Jews thought God was a Being whose care of his children extended but litt e beyond this term of their

existence; he had done much, they thought, to adapt this world to minister to their comfort and happiness, but they recognised little in their own nature which was adapted for another, a spiritual, an eternal existence.

Now in opposition to all this, and in opposition to as false and more debasing views of the heathen, the great truth which Christ taught, the *first* truth, the first in importance, the first in his divine system of religion, the great central truth which gives to that system its peculiarity and worth, was that God is our Father. He is our Father, not because he made us and watches over us; he made the plant and the tree, and he watches over them, yet we do not call him their Father. The relation is a spiritual one, and therefore it is nearer, and, if felt, more endearing. He is our Father because he has given us spirits like his own, he has imparted to us his own immortality, and has blessed us with that noblest of all his gifts, a capacity of ever-growing holiness and joy. How successfully does this great truth, as unfolded by Jesus Christ, war with all the unworthy opinions the Jews entertained of God! He has a name the repetition of which we need not shun, nor which when we must pronounce it, should be uttered with a chilling dread or superstitious awe; with delight and joy we may pronounce that name, and in all our blessed communications with the great Power above us Christ hath taught us to say, "Our Father who art in Heaven." There is no privileged priest to whom alone he reveals himself, nor is there any gorgeous temple to which his communications are confined; the choice temple of his residence is the pure heart, and the priest that enjoys his holiest revelations is he who seeks to do his will. He is no vindictive Being; he is enemy to no one; and those who are enemies to him he seeks to overcome by exhibiting to them a goodness which shall constrain them to repentance. He is no partial Being, no privileged nation or race are the sole recipients of his favours; the blessings of his hand are bestowed as freely and as impartially as are the beams of the sun and the showers from heaven. He delights in no costly sacrifices which the sons of plenty alone can offer; the sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart, which the lowliest of his children can bestow. His chief care has been exercised not merely in adapting the circumstances of this life to minister to our convenience and enjoyment; his great regard to us is shown in making this life a fit introduction to a discipline for the life to come. Glorious as this world is in itself, we see but half its marks of wisdom and love till

we look upon it as the temporary scene of the first stage of man's spiritual life. Our Father's great love to us is seen in surrounding us with so many monitors of the better world. We can conceive of no greater exercise of God's power than is shown in making spirits that shall live on, when all this universe of worlds shall be wrapt together as a scroll, and enduing them with capacities for an angel's knowledge and blessedness and love. He has revealed to us a destiny higher and holier than ever dawned upon the mind of the Jew, because he has revealed himself as "our Father who is in heaven." Thus how much is implied in the great truth of God's paternal character! Do we wonder that Christ should have made it a chief object of his teachings to state and illustrate a doctrine so important and fundamental? Do we wonder that he should have selected it as the first truth into a belief of which his disciples were to baptize all nations?

2. Let us consider the second truth into a belief in which the disciples were commissioned to baptize. "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them into a belief in the Son." Next to the great truth of God's paternal character and of the near and spiritual relation we sustain to him, what is the truth which appears to our own minds most important, and which we ourselves should next mention in a brief synopsis of Christian doctrines? Is it not that which is next mentioned in the text, our Father's gift of his Son, his sending a messenger of grace, mercy, and peace to us, the revelation of light and strength and hope and promise by him? Now at the time this commission to baptize was given, the great body of the Jews believed that their long expected Messiah had not appeared. They had heard of Jesus, but he was not the Christ. Their Saviour was yet to come. The command of Jesus to his disciples was to baptize the Jews into a belief, first, of the paternal character of God, then into a belief that his Son had appeared, the Messiah had come, the new dispensation had been given, the promised kingdom had been set up. Or if we look to the then Gentile world, we shall find a state of feeling existing which rendered the requirement of a belief in the Son peculiarly pertinent and necessary. Some distinguished men of the heathen world were at this time expecting a revelation from God. Probably this expectation was in part natural to the human mind, it might also have been received by communicating with the Jews, or it might have been handed down by tradition from distinguished philosophers of antiquity, some of whom expressed strong conviction that God would

in a miraculous manner reveal himself to mankind. However acquired, the expectation was by some certainly entertained; but the idea that *Jesus* was the channel through whom divine truth was communicated to men was undoubtedly to many, as it was to the Greeks, foolishness, and as it was to the Hebrews, a stumbling-block. Others, again, were in no such expectation of a revelation from heaven, and would be backward in believing that such a revelation had been made. But the learned and the unlearned heathen, the Jew and Gentile, men of all nations, were the disciples to baptize to a belief in the Son, to a conviction that a message had been sent from on high and sent by God's chosen messenger, to a faith in a new revelation of clearer light, of more quickening motives, of more purifying and elevating truths, and of glorious, even immortal hopes. Surely this great truth was in our Saviour's teaching second only to the higher truth of God's paternal character, and therefore he selected it as the next great truth into which his disciples were to baptize all nations.

3. But he mentions one other. "Go ye and teach all nations baptizing into a belief in the Holy Ghost." We are plainly given to understand what this Holy Ghost is in the first five verses of the nineteenth chapter of Acts. We there read that Paul came to Ephesus, "and finding certain disciples he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then Paul baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when he had laid his hands upon them the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Now here you will observe these five things. 1. That although these men are called *disciples*, they had never heard of the Holy Ghost, and consequently could not have believed that the Holy Ghost was a person in the Godhead. 2. That neither before nor after their baptism is it said that Paul informed them that the Holy Ghost was a distinct person, but leaves them to learn from the consequence of his laying his hands upon them what the Holy Ghost is. 3. That Paul speaks of the Holy Ghost *as something to be received;* not as a person — but as what *should come upon them.* 4. That when they had miraculous power from God they had the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, then, is the miraculous power of God. All Scripture confirms this. Jesus and John, Elizabeth and Zacharias, Peter and Stephen,

were filled with the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost came upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. To be baptized into the Holy Ghost is to be baptized into a belief of the miraculous power of God. 5. Into a faith in this miraculous power, Paul, by his question to the disciples, implies that *they ought* to have been baptized. Are we not, therefore, bound to conclude that this miraculous power is what our Saviour alluded to in the commission we are considering, and under which Paul acted? Now what pertinency was there, it may be asked, in our Saviour's requiring his disciples to baptize all men into faith in this power? And here again I would ask, suppose we were required to draw up a short synopsis of Christian doctrine, — after speaking of God as the universal, impartial, benignant Parent of his children, after speaking of Jesus Christ as one who had taught new and striking truths respecting God and duty, what should we be likely to mention next? Would not the third and last point be *the evidence* that this personage was what he pretended to be? By adding this last to the other two specifications should we not have covered the whole ground, and have presented a brief but perfect synopsis of Christian truth? Should we not, after mentioning these three things, first, that God is our Father, second, that Jesus is his Son, and third, that all that he said and performed was done by the miraculous power of God, should we not have repeated the three grand features of our religion, and those on which Jesus Christ more than on any others insisted? Accordingly we find that Christ mentioned this belief in his miraculous power next. He frequently referred to his miracles as proof of his divine mission. "The works that I do, I do not of myself, the Father that sent me, he doeth the works." "Believe me for my works' sake." But the Jews said he was mad, that he had a demon, that he did these things by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. This was that sin against the Holy Ghost which our Lord said should not be forgiven. The sin was their ascribing to the agency of an evil spirit what he did by the power of God. If we look, too, to the heathen world, we find that the Gentiles would attribute his miracles, as they did those of Moses, to magic, and would regard him as one of the many impostors who would establish a false religion by pretending to work miracles. In opposition to these opinions both of the Jews and the Gentiles, our Lord requires his disciples to baptize all into a belief that he was, not merely a teacher, but a teacher from God. Converts to his religion were to believe that he did come forth from God, that God

illuminated his mind, poured out his spirit upon him without measure, and to be convinced that never man spake as he did, and that no man could do the things which he did unless God was with him. The miracles which our Lord wrought were thus to be regarded as sanctions of all that he said and did. They were proofs of the divinity of his mission, and pledges of the fulfilment of his promises.

Such, then, are my views of the interpretation of this formulary of Christian baptism. It is full of important meaning, every word of it is of weighty significance. It was customary in all baptisms to baptize into a profession of faith in some person or doctrine. Our Lord says, "Go ye and teach all nations," not the Jews only, but all, baptizing them into a belief, in the one, universal, benignant Father of mankind, into a belief of Jesus as his Son, the Messiah, the teacher of everlasting life, into a belief in the miraculous power of God, as exercised by Jesus to confirm his mission and to sanction his truth. If I should be asked for the arguments by which I would support the interpretation now given, I could only reply that, beyond presenting in stronger light the various points already alluded to, I have no argument at all. For it has seemed to me all the while, that I have been narrating simple matters of fact; and instead of building up any theory of my own, or proposing any far-fetched interpretation, I have been engaged in the humbler and better work of stating over in other language our Lord's brief and concise command. I know that many find in this text a distinct statement of a doctrine to which they profess great attachment, but which we concur in disbelieving. On the point whether this text states that doctrine or not, I should have but this simple question to propose, Which is most likely, that our Lord should require his disciples to baptize converts to believe in a doctrine which he never taught, — for the passage where our Lord teaches the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost has as yet never been found, — or that he should require them to baptize men to a faith in the three leading doctrines in his religion, doctrines which he considered as the characteristic features of his system, as is evident from his uniform anxiety to state and illustrate them?

I have dwelt at considerable length upon this subject, because I deem it important. It is important that we should know the significance of language Christ has taught us to use in the solemn rite of his appointment. It is important to know to what faith we are baptized, whom we covenant to follow, and what

we covenant to believe. It is important for us to feel, when we offer either ourselves or our children in baptism, that no language is used which throws distrust upon the precious truths to which we have attained, but that the words we repeat are a lucid statement and a confirmation, strong as the authority of Jesus, of the simple faith we prize. What is this formulary of baptism but a creed, a creed not written in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but made by our Master, even Christ? And if we believe in it with all our hearts, whatever others may call us, Christ will own us as his followers, and will pledge to us his everlasting favour. We would be ready, then, to profess before many witnesses our *belief*, our *joyful*, *hearty* belief, of the simple but quickening truths which Jesus has here required; and we would rejoice to set apart to these truths those whose religious education has been committed to our hands. We would receive these truths which he has taught us, and doubt not he will never reject us for refusing to mingle with them what he has not required.

H. A. Miles.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.

No. II.

LARGE MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

In a former article we expressed the opinion that small manufacturing establishments are upon the whole beneficial to a community. As to those factories upon the largest plan, we do not feel warranted from facts to say that even they contribute to pauperism. Both now and at all former periods, the agricultural districts of England are beyond comparison more burdened with pauperism than manufacturing districts. We hear much of the distress of workmen at Manchester, and the impossibility of their procuring work; but all these accounts are greatly exaggerated. Political and party motives so distort facts that we hardly know what is true or what false. That wretchedness exists there on a large scale, and wretchedness arising from poverty, is most true. Still, no class of labourers in England have so constant employment and so good pay as the opera-

tives in large factories. Fewer fluctuations in business affect them, and their wages are quite sufficient for a comfortable support. The mobs and riots, which we usually attribute to the distress of want, have their origin in moral causes, almost independently of the means of support.

It must, however, be remembered that England was but recently changed into a manufacturing country. Little more than thirty years ago she was an agricultural state. There has not yet been time for a full developement of all the moral influences which arise from the change. If these influences are allowed to go on unrestrained, we believe that they will ultimately have a most unhappy effect, not only upon the moral character of the people, but, indirectly, upon pauperism; at the same time making it more common, more degrading, and more distressing.

In our remarks upon this topic, we would confine ourselves to influences naturally belonging to large manufacturing towns. We shall not intentionally touch upon those which happen to exist in particular parts of a particular country. The insulated facts which we may chance to mention must be considered as illustrations rather than arguments. We put no confidence in political arithmetic or political facts. Statements, without all the details connected with them, whether drawn from statistical tables or from any other source of information, are not merely useless, but dangerous. As generally written, it is hard to tell whether history, "teaching by example," has done more good or harm to the cause of true philosophy. The remarks which we would offer have been prepared with much caution and distrust, and they are founded more upon the nature of large manufacturing establishments, than upon the many important facts that have fallen within our notice. The inference that we would draw from our examination is, that while these establishments have been favourable rather than injurious to legal pauperism, they have yet contributed sadly to the worst evils with which poverty is cursed — bad health and bad morals.

1. *Health.* "At thirty," says an experienced witness, who had long been employed in a cotton factory in Manchester, "both men and women *were* as I am, at sixty; at forty, they are obliged to wear glasses; and if they got up to fifty it was only an odd one or two." Here is perhaps exaggeration. What say the bills of mortality? According to them the average mortality for England in 1780 was one in forty; in 1810, one in fifty-three; in 1820, one in fifty-seven; and in 1833, one

in sixty; but, upon examining more particularly, we see that in Middlesex the annual deaths are one in forty-seven; in Lancashire, one in fifty-five; while in agricultural districts they are one in sixty-three, one in seventy, and in some places only one in eighty-four. These tables may not be exact; but all allowance being made for errors, it is certain that in manufacturing, as in other large towns, the mortality is much greater than in rural districts.

We must not, however, judge from this alone. Places in which the mortality is greatest are not *therefore* the most unhealthy. On the contrary, many chronic disorders tend rather to protract than to cut short the term of life. The constitution upon which, in their milder forms, they have fixed their hold, is weakened, and thereby rendered less obnoxious to violent disorders. The fountain of life flows in one continued stream of bitterness; but it still flows on. Factories are especially fitted to produce this sort of complaints. Their uninterrupted employment, their high temperature, their close atmosphere, all conspire to destroy the vigour of the constitution, at the same time that they leave sufficient strength to carry on the work of vitality and to perform the monotonous labours of the place.

Fatal consumptions are not common. Coughs and asthmatic affections are the prevailing disorders. "On the whole it may be said," says a writer who had looked carefully into the subject, "that the class of manufacturers [in England] engaged in mill-labour exhibit but few well defined diseases; but that nearly the entire number are victims to a train of irregular morbid actions, chiefly indicated by disturbances in the functions of the digestive apparatus, with their consequent effects upon the nervous system; producing melancholy, extreme mental irritability, and great exhaustion, and that few acute maladies exist among them; that their existence, though passed in one long disease, does not seem shortened. Few among them can be said to enjoy good health; all are more or less ailing."

Let us look a step farther. What must be the offspring of such parents? If constitutional disorders and infirmities are hereditary, what must the race become in the second, third, and fourth generation? We cannot find that the mortality among children is so great in any city of Europe as in Manchester; where nearly one half of all that are born die before they are two years old. And the ratio is increasing. Thirty years ago, five years after birth was the period within which

one half of all who were brought into the world had left it; and this notwithstanding the general enlarged average of human life.

2. *Morals.* From the health to the morals of these people the transition is easy. Both partake of the same general characteristics; both are alike languishing and sickly; always diseased; but generally free from violent disorders. Relief from the distressing exhaustion of their daily toil must be sought by them. But the polluted atmosphere of a crowded manufacturing town cannot restore them; the damp, crowded, ill-furnished apartments of their private dwellings cannot restore them; still, relief must be had, and the ale-house is the only resort. Stimulating liquors, whether tea, coffee, or ardent spirits, are among no class so much depended upon and resorted to as among mill-labourers, and unfortunately the high price of their labour allows them the indulgence. Yet intemperance does not here, as in other employments, lead directly to pauperism. The enfeebled frame is still able to wait upon machines, which require little strength and no moral responsibility.

We have said that the health and morals of mill-labourers partake of the same general characteristics. It is a singular fact that the number of mercenary crimes increase with the progress of civilization, while crimes of violence decrease in about the same ratio. Thus in England (1826) the proportion of mercenary crimes to the whole population is seven times as great as in Spain, the most ignorant and degraded of all countries pretending to civilization, and more than twice as great as in France. But more than this, mercenary crimes seem multiplied by manufactures. In the North of France (Charles Dupin is our authority) the increase of manufactures has been marked by the increase of mercenary crimes. So with the manufacturing portions of Ireland, and, yet more remarkably, with the manufacturing parts of England. This disproportion will appear much greater, if we consider that crimes of violence are far more easily detected than crimes against property, and that fewer, therefore, will escape unpunished.

What does this show respecting the character of manufacturing people in large towns? Crimes of violence are usually the effect of passion. They do not argue, more especially in the rude stages of society, any considerable depravity of character. But when theft, fraud, and other mercenary crimes thrive, and crimes of violence become less frequent, it

is plain that the passions are kept under; but that there is a spirit of cold-blooded calculation, a degradation, a depravity of character, to which society in its early stages is a stranger. Crimes of violence more outrage the feelings; but it may well be doubted whether they so much endanger the well-being of the social system.

But how happens it that a manufacturing population should be particularly exposed to these evils? Are they accidental, or necessarily woven into the constitution of manufacturing towns? To us they seem to be a necessary part of these establishments. They are the effect of causes which are inseparable from overgrown manufacturing towns.

The bad health that we have just mentioned will, to those who are in the habit of considering the influences of our animal upon our higher nature, appear to be a demoralizing agent of no common power. But to enumerate other influences. Large numbers are crowded together into hot rooms. In many parts of factories the operatives live in a temperature unnaturally hot; and medical men have undertaken to say that children who are brought up in these hot houses have in their temperament the precocious flames of those who are born within the tropics. Their animal passions are as premature and as strong. We would not lay great stress on this point; we believe that it has been overstated by ardent writers. Still, the heated temperature of the rooms, and the circumstance that both sexes* are crowded together into them, may be one of the reasons why one twelfth of the children born in Manchester are illegitimate.

Another evil, of still greater magnitude, and which is inseparable from all factories, is the unremitted, interminable attention which the operatives are obliged to pay to their machinery. "The tediousness and everlasting sameness of the work prey upon their spirits" and break down their minds. "The day a man becomes a slave, he loses half his soul." But the labourers in a factory are slaves, not to men, to beings endowed like themselves with a moral capacity, acting upon their own responsibility, able to change, or to mitigate the rigour of their laws,—slaves, not to such beings, but to matter, to brute, insensate matter; bound, without all hope of release, to wait upon and to watch the eternal motions of a water-wheel

*The sexes are not thus mingled in this country. Male labour is, in consequence of the demand for it among farmers, little employed in manufactures, except to make machinery and to superintend the work. But were we a manufacturing people it would not be so.

or a steam-engine; in every sense of the word, slaves to their mighty antagonist, "which toils with a pertinacity and unvarying continuance" that tire the strongest heart.

J. H. M.

Jesus a Divine Teacher of Morals.

Some Christians of the present day appear to regard the work of a moral teacher as the lowest part of Christ's office; and some have been so presumptuous as to assert that if he had no higher office he might as well never have been sent, as there have lived and yet live uninspired men fully competent to it. To this statement I cannot assent; for where human teachers have been in the main correct, they have often given license to single sins; where they have been unexceptionable, their systems have been adapted to the circumstances of but a single class of men or a single nation, and human teachers have not authority to enforce their precepts. A moral teacher from God was needed that he might give us a perfect system of morals, one adapted to all men, and one promulgated and sanctioned with sufficient authority. I will therefore endeavour, in this and the following communications, to show the need in which mankind stood of having a teacher sent from God.

In the present article I wish to prove that a divine moral teacher was needed in order that a perfectly pure system of morals might be promulgated.

It is often said by unbelievers that Christ brought forward no new precepts; that every principle which he recommends for the government of the heart and life may be found in the writings of the Greek and Oriental philosophers. I have no disposition to dispute the fact. It ought to be cheerfully conceded by those who regard the God whose inspiration gave man understanding and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as one and the same Being. Nor does this concession derogate from the importance of Christ's mission. The elements of organic and animal existence were imbedded in chaos, when the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep; but it was

not until the Spirit of God had brooded over the abyss, that shape or order or beauty appeared. And thus the disjointed elements of gospel morality had gleamed forth from time to time amidst the gross moral darkness which covered the earth; but it was not until he came upon whom the spirit was poured forth without measure, that the symmetry of a perfect whole presented itself. Before Christ appeared, there were numerous moral systems, some of them nearly, but none altogether, faultless. One system required strict honesty, disinterested benevolence and patriotism, but left its disciples at liberty to sunder at pleasure the bonds of domestic society. Another forbade anger, fraud, and all social offences, but permitted the unreserved indulgence of appetite. Another cherished every military virtue, but permitted unbounded selfishness and avarice. Another echoed the maxim of the corrupt Jews: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy." Another required its disciple to be strictly virtuous while he lived, but permitted him to terminate his life as soon as he was weary of it. And thus among the exemplars, nay, among the teachers of virtue in the ancient heathen world, there were the sensual, the avaricious, the proud, the unforgiving, the suicide, — men who, weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, would be light as air, — men who were less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. And the adherents of any particular system of morals were generally more distinguished by the vice or vices which that system permitted, than by the virtues which it enjoined. Thus in the Spartan code of morals, courage was recognised as the greatest of virtues, while selfishness and avarice were deemed honourable rather than disgraceful. The names of some Spartan cowards are preserved on record; but history does not furnish us with a single instance of disinterestedness in that nation, from the days of Lycurgus, the founder of their polity, to the period of its dissolution. Indeed, a system which in common discourse is styled nearly perfect may be and often is as deleterious to the moral character as one confessedly very imperfect. A country liable to inundation is as much in danger, when one single foot of the barrier which defends it is thrown down, as it would be if the whole were made level with the ground; and thus a moral code which leaves a single avenue for vice is as dangerous as one which makes no distinction between vice and virtue.

Let us suppose such a system. Let us suppose one which, unexceptionable in every other regard, says nothing against

the love of money. Its disciple has his affections as yet unoccupied by any object of exclusive attachment. He may perhaps scorn to avail himself of this defect. If so, he will look within and above him, will love God and cherish the elements of spiritual life, will become a truly virtuous man. But he may perhaps reason thus with himself: "Here are some of my fellow-men bound down to the indulgence of appetite; others, reckless of the claims of justice and humanity, rushing breathless in the pursuit of glory; others finding their highest pleasure in acts of tyranny and usurpation. From all these sources of enjoyment I have debarred myself. But money, which answers so important, so essential a purpose in the economy of life, even my severe lawgiver allows me unrestrained liberty to seek and use; and its pursuit and enjoyment shall therefore fill the time and engross the affections which those about me devote to forbidden objects." He will thus commence the pursuit of gain, at first with moderation and in perfect accordance with the discharge of all required duties; but all the passions of man are progressive, and Mammon will soon become the god of his soul, crowding out of his mind his religious and social duties, or making the discharge of them purely mechanical; and when this is once the case, the man is as truly and thoroughly a bad man as if he had many besetting sins. Indeed, he is more hopelessly depraved; for the concentration of his powers and affections upon a single object gives that object a power over him, which a distracted mind could never confer upon one or all of several unworthy objects of interest. — Thus we see that a *nearly* perfect system will not do. We want a perfect law. We want to have the floodgates shut fast against iniquity. We want not a single aperture, however small, left for its entrance; for through even the smallest it may inundate the soul. When Christ began to teach, the human mind had been striving for four thousand years to plan a perfect moral code. It had shown itself inadequate to the work. The task was above man. Man needed a teacher sent from God. It would have been as easy for an uninspired teacher to have raised Lazarus from the dead as to have delivered the sermon on the mount. Thus have I proved that a divine teacher was needed to promulgate a perfect system of morals.

A. P. Peabody.

The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

The gift of prophecy, when the possession of it is attested, is the highest evidence of a divine mission. He who claims to be a teacher sent from God must appeal to some higher testimony, in support of such a claim, than to the mere excellence of his doctrines, however remarkable that may be. If he would do more than excite the interest and fix the attention of some of the more reflecting among those to whom he asserts the divinity of his mission, and aspire to the general reception to which his claims if supported will entitle him, he must appeal to miracles, wrought either for him or by him. These miracles may be either miracles of *power*, or miracles of *knowledge*. The latter include the gift of prophecy. To those who live in an age when a divine revelation is communicated by the mouth of an inspired teacher, the exhibition of miraculous power, by reversions of the order of nature, and interferences in the known course of events, which their senses would afford them the means of investigating, would be at once an indispensable requisite and a satisfactory occasion of belief. The mere prediction of a future event, however great might be the sagacity employed in studying the passions of the human heart or the intricate operation of successive causes and effects, might prove the teacher to be possessed of wonderful penetration and the most consummate wisdom; but till the prophecy has been attested by its fulfilment, this wisdom would by few, if any, be exalted above worldly skill. But the farther we advance from the time when the miraculous power was exhibited, the acknowledgment of such occurrences and the reception of the truths which they establish depend upon further investigation and an examination of evidence which at first was unnecessary.

We must search for many arguments before we assent to the truth of statements where so high an interest is involved as to make indifference or carelessness not only unauthorized but even inexcusable. That the miraculous events recorded in the Scriptures, particularly in those of the New Testament, stand upon such evidence as at once sets them above all cavil or possibility of dispute, has often been fairly and ably demonstrated. This is a subject with which we have at present no concern. We merely wish to mark the distinction, that while the proof required to establish the actual occur-

rence of miraculous events necessarily increases from age to age, nothing of this need be said in relation to that kind of evidence for a divine mission which is offered in the pronouncement and fulfilment of prophecy. Once establish the fact that an event was predicted, and that it was subsequently accomplished in agreement with the particular specifications, which history makes a very easy matter, record the result, and the evidence will be as satisfactory in one century as in another.

We might here speak of the sublime truths which are made known to us in the very nature and intention of prophecy, — of the indisputable evidence which it affords of the existence of an almighty Sovereign, of his overruling providence, of the interest which he takes in the concerns of man, of his omniscience, of our absolute dependence upon him, and our obligation to venerate and obey him. But we wish to notice here the fulfilment of a prophecy which is unsurpassed by any other in the explicitness of detail which attended its utterance, and the remarkable, the awful lesson conveyed in its minute accomplishment, — we mean the Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

The gift of prophecy being, as we have said, so high a proof of a divine mission, we should expect that it would be appealed to by all who have aspired to such a title, whether they have deserved it or not. Such we find to have been the case. Pagans had their oracles, augurs, and soothsayers, and modern idolaters have their necromancers and diviners. Impostures have been as frequent here as in the pretensions to miraculous power, inasmuch as the facilities for deception are equally numerous in both cases. Credulity may be imposed upon, the victims of the deception may be made unwittingly to contribute to their own errors, and natural means may be so used, especially where ignorance and superstition prevail, as to appear supernatural, as well in pretensions to the power of predicting future events, as to that of performing miraculous acts. That such pretensions should be made is what we should have suspected beforehand. Some men have been led to reject all claims both to the power of working miracles and that of prophesying, solely on the ground of these impositions. If they followed this principle in all the concerns of life they would see its absurdity. It is well here always to remember that if there were no genuine power ever exerted there never would have been pretensions to it; as the circulation of counterfeit notes acknowledges the real value of such as

they are intended to imitate. Many impostors have enjoyed for a longer or shorter time the character of prophets, who had no claim whatever to such a title. This fact should make us watchful in guarding against deception, and lead us to apply every necessary test. If we do this we may rest assured we shall not be deceived. Every false pretence to the prophetic spirit, if it have succeeded at all, will be found to have done so from one of the three following causes: either the event was not actually foretold in such explicit language as forbade all danger of mistake; or, if foretold in such a manner, was of such a nature that nothing more than human wisdom was needed to foresee it; or, lastly, though it may have been predicted in plain terms, yet was not accomplished according to the prophecy. History affords us examples where claims to the power of prophesying have been admitted, which have yet been proved to be false, from one, or more, of these deficiencies. The three conditions which we have given afford us a fair test by which we may estimate the truth or falsehood of a claim to the power of prophesying. We would apply them to the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem which was made by our Saviour to his disciples and the Jews.

I. Our Saviour foretold the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, in language which could not be mistaken.

II. The event which he predicted was such as with the attendant circumstances no human power could have foreseen.

III. The prediction was actually and circumstantially fulfilled.

I. Our Saviour foretold the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, in language which could not be mistaken.

1. In the first place, we find the most explicit language in relation to this event in each of the first three gospels, (Matthew xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.) But before any stress can be laid upon this argument, it must be proved that the records which contain this language were written before the event. This is a fact which we establish in the same manner with regard to these books as we do with regard to any other, namely, by consulting the uniform opinion of those who had the means of knowing the truth, and by the absence of any contrary testimony. The temple was burnt on the tenth of July, A. D. 70. The prediction must, then, have been uttered at least thirty-seven years before the event, and was recorded by the Evangelists when they composed their Gospels. It is evident, then,

if we can show the existence of either of the Gospels in which it is contained, prior to the event, that we establish our point. Take, for instance, Luke's Gospel; of this the Acts of the Apostles is a continuation by the same author. (Acts i. 1.) In this history we find a hint to guide us in settling the time of its composition. The last verse but one leaves Paul at Rome between the years sixty-three and sixty-five. This was in all probability the period at which the history was composed; and as his Gospel was written previously, the prediction was recorded by Luke at least six years before it was fulfilled. Besides this, though critics have differed about the precise year of the publication of the first three Gospels, they have all *concurred* in assigning them a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. The latest date which has been given to them is the year sixty-four; by some writers of authority twenty years earlier. There is, then, every reason to believe that the prophecy was recorded previous to its fulfilment. The language, too, cannot be mistaken. Circumstances are foretold, which would precede, accompany, and follow the catastrophe. The time of the event was given within certain limits. "*That generation* was not to pass away, till all was fulfilled." Many minute particulars, which we hardly notice in the records, were clearly specified. Of these we shall again speak, when we come to the fulfilment.

2. But it is not only in explicit statements that the calamities impending upon the Jews are foretold; we find another very strong argument that the prediction was actually made in the fact that our Saviour frequently refers to the event in distant allusions. The Evangelists have recorded many of his sayings in which we now observe a direct reference to the fate of the Jewish nation and religion, though the writers do not seem to have been aware of them when they composed their Gospels. We might select numerous passages from each of the first three Gospels, where, in the parables which the Saviour uttered, the rebukes which he laid upon the Pharisees, and, more than all, in his instructions concerning the nature of his kingdom and the purposes of his mission, he not only infers, but takes for granted, that the Jewish system was to be superseded; and that, too, in a manner which should show that he who abolished it was no other than the Omnipotent One, who for his own wise purposes had established it.

3. We found a third argument for the reality of the prediction upon the honesty and candour of the historians who recorded it. The veracity of the Evangelists is established in

the most satisfactory manner, from the nature of their office, the absence of every possible motive for deception, their open and simple manner of stating what bears against themselves, such as the Saviour's rebukes of their want of faith and blindness of heart, and their readiness to seal the truth of their doctrines with their blood. "Cunning," says Paley, "was no quality of theirs;" and he forcibly argues that if they were recording the prediction subsequently to its fulfilment, they would have dropped some hint either knowingly or carelessly respecting its completion, such as designating the time more accurately, mentioning the name of the general or emperor who commanded, or noting the nation and number of the enemy. St. Luke, after speaking of the prediction of a famine by Agabus (Acts xi. 28), says, "Which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." Numberless instances occurred where the Evangelists, if honest men, and recording the prediction after its fulfilment, could hardly have failed to drop some hint of the fact. If, however, they were dishonest historians, and wished to create a belief that they were writing before the event, they would have endeavoured in some covert manner to inform their readers that they were writing with more honest intentions. But besides the absence of any and every argument by which the slightest suspicion can be brought upon the historians, a remarkable circumstance, arising from the relation contained in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, puts this matter beyond all dispute. Christ there speaks of the time and manner in which his kingdom would be established by the overthrow of Judaïsm, but there is mixed with this account much that evidently had no reference to Jerusalem or the Jewish faith in particular, and is understood by all critics of authority as applying to the final judgment of the world. It will appear evident to anyone who reads the discourse of our Saviour as given by Matthew, that the Evangelist considered the whole as having reference to the same event, namely, the coming of the Son of Man, which would take place when, by the destruction of the temple, the Jewish system would be formally abolished and Christianity established in its stead. If, therefore, he had written after the event, when he would have found that but a part of the discourse related to it, his language would have been more explicit.* The more closely we examine this fact,

* There has been a difference of opinion concerning the meaning and reference of the parables contained in Matthew xxiv. and xxv. Some commentators making the whole refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, oth-

the more clear it will appear that the Evangelist was relating a discourse of which he did not then comprehend the precise bearing, and would not till the event had shown it more plainly.

4. Another argument in support of our position, that the prediction of our Saviour was plainly stated and circulated before the event, is found in the fact that none of the Christians suffered in the calamities. The passages which contain the prediction abound in exhortations to the first disciples to save themselves by an early flight. The signal that was to warn them was the appearance of images which the law strictly forbade, namely, the Roman eagles, "the abomination which rendered desolate," standing in the Holy Place, by which was meant not only the temple, but any part of Judea.* They were then commanded to save themselves by instant flight; not to delay long enough to take with them the most necessary articles of life. The ruin predicted was to be general though not total, and no security was offered to those who should slight the warning. Now these predictions were either known to the early Christians, or they were not. If they were not, it would have been idle in anyone, who wrote after the event, to say that such warnings had been given, which the event would have disproved. It is evident likewise if the Christians acted up to the commands, and followed the admonitions there given, that they must really have possessed them. We know that they did act in this manner, that at the first approach of danger, they fled; why were they so much wiser than their countrymen? We have no reason to suppose that a single Christian suffered in the conflict. They are supposed to have left before the siege began. Some went to Pella, as mentioned by Eusebius, a city on the other side

---

ers to the final judgment of the world, while a third class have maintained with more plausibility that a part refers to one event, and a part to the other, but have been at a loss to find the point of transition. The difficulty is removed by a more exact translation of the 31st verse of chap. xxv. We may suppose the account, thus far, to refer to the establishment of Christianity by the subversion of Judaism, and after this, to the character of Christianity, and the manner in which, under its direction, the rewards and punishments of the judgment-day would be distributed. Thus we are told of the circumstances which should attend upon the establishment of Christianity, and (v. 31) of the state of things when it is established — "When the Son of Man *shall have come* . . . . . then, after that, thenceforward, men shall be judged by the laws of Christianity" — which are there made known.

* Lardner, *Jew. Test.* Vol. vi. p. 408.

of Jordan; others might have gone elsewhere into remote countries where they could obtain a settlement.*

But though the Christians had all remained at Jerusalem, and been involved in the common fate, we must still admit that they possessed these warnings, unless we wish to suppose a most extended scheme of imposture and trickery, of which there is not the slightest appearance. We have every proof which the nature of the case admits, that the woe was denounced earnestly and frequently. The warning was heard both by friends and enemies. The former, we know, heeded it; the latter were exasperated by it, and were satisfied only by the blood of him who had dared to speak so presumptuously, as they thought it, of the people and the religion which the Almighty had designated as his own. The knowledge of the prediction was faithfully circulated by the apostles among the several communities. The allusions to it in the Epistles are very numerous.† Such were the expectations excited that the fulfilment of the prophecy was undoubtedly looked upon by many who wavered in their choice as the test of the truth of the religion whose claims were to be thus supported. Many were looking anxiously for the appearance of the slightest signs that the great and terrible day was drawing nigh. If the prediction had not been so explicitly made to the apostles that it would have been impossible for them to doubt, it is hardly to be supposed that they would have risked their credit and the cause of their religion, for which they offered themselves, to any sacrifice, on such a dubious issue.

We might enlarge upon these points, and multiply the arguments which offer themselves so abundantly to establish the reality of the prediction, but those we have already given must be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that upon this point the evidence is conclusive. The words were uttered which foretold the ruin of Jerusalem; they were recorded before the event, with a precision and circumstantiality which forbade everything like duplicity or deception.

II. The event predicted was such as with the attendant circumstances no merely human power could have foreseen.

What was it which our Saviour foretold? It was that before that generation had passed away the Deity would

* Matth. xxiv. 15, 16. Mark xiii. 14. Luke xxi. 20.

† Heb. x. 25; 1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Timothy vi. 14; James v. 7, 8; 1 Peter iv. 7, &c.

desert the temple where he had so long been worshipped, — that it should be laid level with the ground, — that the whole city should be wasted and destroyed, — that the system, which the misinterpreted voice of prophecy had declared to be as everlasting as the hills, was to pass away, — that sacrifices and ceremonies were no longer to be accepted, — and that that prayer would ascend nearest to the throne of God which came through the lips of the despised Christians, and rose in the name of him who came out of Galilee. This was but the result which was foretold. Ere the time for its completion arrived the whole world was to be agitated. Earthquakes, wars, famines, and pestilences were to mark the change in the counsels of Jehovah. False Christs and false prophets were to arise. The appearance was not, like the twinkling of a star, to be confined to a single spot, but would be rather like the lightning which lighteth up the heavens from east to west. All these were to be preceded and accompanied by the extension of the name and kingdom of him in whose behalf the mighty revolution was to take place.

Such was the result foretold, and such were some of the unusual signs which were to attend and follow it. Can it be said that human sagacity was sufficient to foresee these effects, and that uninspired lips could have foretold them? Let it be remembered that the prediction was uttered thirty-seven years before its fulfilment, and that it was not merely a single event, depending upon the combined influence of causes known to be at work, which was foretold, but an extended and mighty revolution, such as the world never before or since beheld; where the causes and effects were alike above the reach of human wisdom to discover or to comprehend. Many of the incidents which accompanied the final catastrophe were such as did not necessarily have the most remote connexion with it, and could not have been foreseen by human wisdom even before their immediate occurrence, yet these were made known with equal distinctness. No one will presume to say that human penetration was all that was needed, especially when the circumstances are duly considered. It has been said that misfortune had long threatened the Jews, and that the storm which had been gathering at a distance must soon have broken over their heads. Even if this assertion were fully true, it would do little to support the opinion, that, though the calamities of the Jews had been multiplying, human wisdom could trace the issue in that long train of events specified in the prediction. But we cannot admit the assertion. Jose-

phus, who lived in that age, and was a man of much penetration, affords satisfactory proof, in the history which he has left us, that nothing could have been farther from his mind than a suspicion that the Jewish religion was approaching to its end. It is true that even in the times of the Saviour various causes were at work, which afterwards contributed to the accomplishment of the prediction; yet these causes, so far from portending the destruction of Jerusalem, did not even furnish the slightest expectation for the wars. Besides all this, the situation of the Jews at the time of the Saviour's prediction was much more favourable to their prosperity than it was before or after it. The government of Pilate was mild and easy. The Jews were allowed many privileges. His successors, too, were comparatively virtuous in their administration, and it was not till the time of Gessius Florus, the last governor, that their grievances became intolerable. The impending calamity, then, was not only uncertain, but improbable, at the time of its prediction. It is worthy of remark that the soldiers who first commenced hostilities, and were the prime cause of those disturbances which ended in such an unexpected catastrophe, had been once ordered to depart from their garrison by the emperor, who subsequently permitted their stay at their earnest supplication. It was only by their repeated cruelties that the Jews were impelled to resistance; and had they gone as they had been ordered, their place would have been supplied by less sanguinary guards, and the catastrophe which they brought about, deferred for a long time at least, if not wholly averted. Josephus, speaking of these soldiers, says, "These are the persons who occasioned the dreadful calamities which befel the Jews, and laid, during the government of Florus, the foundation of those troubles which afterwards broke out into an open war; on which account they were banished from the province by order of Vespasian."* The character of the emperor, too, who planned the siege of Jerusalem, and accomplished, though, as will afterwards be seen, unwillingly, the doom which had been pronounced upon it, was by no means such as to favour the outrages which were committed against the Jews. Titus was the mildest prince who ever swayed the Roman sceptre; and the absence of his father, Vespasian, in Italy, placed the conduct of the war in Judea in his own hands. Though all we can gather from history of

* Joseph. *Antiq.* B. xix. c. 9, p. 2.

his character and intentions satisfies us, that he would not have permitted the devastation, which in the issue he was unable to prevent, this is not the whole proof we have of the unpremeditated fate to which Jerusalem was devoted. We know, likewise, that he interfered frequently, at different periods of the siege, to request of the Jews that they would make terms of capitulation, and thus preserve their temple and nation. That the wishes of the leader who was to accomplish the prediction should be opposed to its fulfilment, is no small proof of the wisdom of him who uttered it.

But by far the most satisfactory proof which can be given for the divinity of that wisdom which could predict the ruin of Jerusalem and the accompanying events is found in the trifling nature of the circumstance which gave birth to the sedition. The account as given by Josephus * is to this effect: — In a narrow and close street in Cæsarea the Jews had a synagogue. As the people were all assembled here on the Sabbath, "A spiteful Cæsarean set an earthen vessel before the door, with a sacrifice of birds upon it." This mockery of their most holy rite irritated the Jews extremely; and though some of the wisest among them were for seeking redress by other means, yet the majority had recourse to blows, for which the Cæsareans were ready to return added insult. Thus a common street broil, at first confined to a few of the more turbulent on both sides, was to be the commencement of those hostilities which should end only in the utter and total subversion of the Jewish state. Every exertion was made by those in authority to allay the tumult. But insult was heaped upon insult. Twelve of the chief men who went to Florus, to petition for a redress of their grievances, were ordered to be seized and bound. Though the Jews were highly exasperated at this act, they endeavoured to suppress their indignation, till they were driven to open though late resistance by the perfidy of Florus, who cast all manner of indignities upon them. By his permission the houses were pillaged, the nobility whipped and crucified, and women in the most critical circumstances were tortured in an aggravated manner. Six hundred and thirty Jews were murdered in one day. After such occurrences, the ruin of Jerusalem might seem possible; but how disproportionate were such effects to the cause!

Yet the prediction of the final issue forms but a small

* *Wars of the Jews*, B. II. chap. xiv.

part of the inspired Teacher's prophetic declaration. Of the minor circumstances of the case we shall presently say more. We have stated the origin of the trouble, which, however slight in itself, was the real commencement of the long train of disasters which immediately overwhelmed the Jewish nation. The most searching human wisdom could not have foreseen it a day before it took place. It should increase the interest with which we study this evidence which the Saviour offered of his divine origin, when we see how insignificant a cause the Almighty selected to bring about so great an end. How wonderfully in this instance were the foolish things of the world chosen to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty! Never was there a greater disproportion between cause and effect. It is no characteristic of human wisdom, when most exalted, to pay so little regard to the philosophy of nature. So entirely were the misfortunes of the Jews to be ascribed, under God, to the unjust and oppressive measures taken by Florus, that it will be admitted on all hands, had anyone, whether wise or foolish, pretended to predicate anything concerning the issue, there is every probability that the disgrace of Florus with the Roman powers and his removal from office would have been the general prophecy. But it was not so. He was permitted to convert a private quarrel into a nation's destruction, and to complete, with fearful accuracy, a prediction that could have been uttered only by a wisdom which was divine.

III. We come now to the third test which we wished to apply to the prophecy, namely, that the prediction was actually and circumstantially fulfilled.

It might seem useless to enlarge upon this point; but if as mere matter of history the inquiry be interesting, of how much more importance is it when we consider its value as an evidence of our religion! an evidence which the most artful infidelity cannot gainsay, nor the coolest indifference resist. We would wish, then, briefly to enumerate the most remarkable points of agreement which present themselves between the prediction and the fulfilment, namely, in the circumstances preceding, accompanying, and closing the occurrence.*

As if to give every opportunity to the Jews to avoid the

* Lardner has done this with great copiousness in the sixth volume of his Complete Works, pp. 400–475.

fate which impended over their national institutions, and to mitigate, as much as possible, the misfortunes of the sufferers, by lessening their numbers, an opportunity of escape was offered to all who would embrace Christianity. The Saviour promised that, before the end arrived, his gospel should be preached in all parts of the world, or the Roman empire. (Matth. xxiv. 14.) We know that this was fulfilled, from the number of churches which soon sprang up under the teachings of the apostles, and the places indicated by the superscriptions of the Epistles, as well as the intentions of the four Evangelists in writing their histories for different communities. Christ, then, gives to his disciples many infallible signs, by which they might mark the "beginning of sorrows." Impostors, false Christs, and false prophets were to arise (Matth. xxiv. 5); a prediction strikingly verified by the large number of enthusiasts and deceivers who arose and contributed very much to distract and divide the already seditious Jews. Of these a long catalogue is furnished by Josephus. The disciples were likewise informed that owing to the severe persecutions they would be called to endure (Matth. xxix. 9, 10, 12,) many would fall from among them, the early victims of violence, of coldness, or the want of faith and zeal. The coming event was likewise to be known by extraordinary national divisions. (Matth. xxiv. 6, 7.) Wars and rumours of wars were to be frequent, nations and kingdoms were to contend with each other. That this prediction was fulfilled appears from the numerous troubles which fill the history of the times. Josephus speaks of different commotions among the Jews, especially at a Passover, when twenty thousand Jews perished; likewise at Samaria, Cæsarea, all over Syria, Scythopolis, Alexandria, Damascus, &c. Heathen historians, though unknowingly, bear the most striking testimony to the truth of this prediction. Commotions of nature likewise were to portend the coming calamity. The whole course of nature would seem to be disturbed, while pestilences and famines accompanied, (Matth. xxiv. 7.) A famine in Judea is mentioned Acts xi. 25 – 30, which is likewise noticed by Eusebius. A famine in Italy is related by Dion Cassius, another by Tacitus, and both by Eusebius. There was a pestilence in Babylon in the year 40, a great mortality at Rome, A. D. 65, and many others in various parts of the Roman empire. Tacitus speaks of an earthquake at Rome, another at Apanea, another in Asia, when Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse were entirely destroyed, and another

in Campania, A. D. 62. These and similar prophecies, so fearfully fulfilled, were thus minutely specified by the Saviour, as signs to those who should believe upon him. Jerusalem was not yet besieged, and there was still time for flight. Warned by such fearful sights, which might well presage coming sorrows, and which could not well be misunderstood, those who had embraced the gospel were to make haste to flee from the devoted city. The tender expressions which marked the Saviour's language, in regard to those whose flight might be accidentally encumbered, gave them good reason to suppose that when the city was once attacked there would be no escape. The time was fixed in "that generation," the appearance of the Roman eagles in the city was the signal, and, as we observed before, there is every reason to suppose that the Christians faithfully obeyed it.

We have no room to trace the progress of the siege of Jerusalem, or to describe the changing fortunes which left the issue very doubtful till it was close at hand. The commencement of hostilities has been already noted. The enemy do not seem to have been aware of the real strength of the Jews, or to have foreseen the obstinate courage with which they would contend for their deliverance. Often, during the protracted war, fortune seemed to favour the Jews, and to promise success to their endeavours. Had not the city within been divided by three factious leaders, which removed everything like unanimity and concert in their counsels, the Roman army would have felt the blow more severely than it did. As it was, the enemy was thrice repulsed with great loss; they were obliged to abandon their original intention of taking the city by storm, and content themselves with closely blockading it, and reducing it by famine. Terms of capitulation were often offered, and as often resolutely refused. The day came when the enemies of Jerusalem, "cast a trench about her, and compassed her around, and kept her in on every side." (Luke xix. 43.) Even when the outer fortifications were destroyed and the enemy had entered into the city, the strong towers within would still have bid defiance to their attacks and cost them further toil and blood, had not famine obliged the Jews to desert them. Well might Titus exclaim, as he admired their strength, "We have certainly had God for our helper in this war! it is God who has ejected the Jews out of these fortifications!" Never was a battle fought in which was displayed more resolute courage, more disinterested devotion, or so many instances of heroic self-sacrifice

for the public good. In every advantage gained by the enemy, and in every discomfiture of the Jews, we are forced to discern the hand of a mysterious power. If we discover it throughout the contest, it is doubly remarkable in the closing scene, to which we hasten.

When the disciples of our Saviour were admiring the grandeur of the temple, particularly the size of the stones of which it was built, he told them that the time was not far distant, when it should be levelled with the ground, and its foundations be obliterated. The manner in which this part of the prediction was fulfilled imparts to our subject much of its thrilling interest, while it affords the most convincing proof of the divinity of that wisdom which foretold it. It was not till after the overthrow of the quadruple wall which enclosed the city, and the demolition of the towers and fortresses which had so long bid defiance to the enemy, that the attention of either party was called to the temple. The daily sacrifices had till this been scrupulously performed. It was at their cessation that the Jews were called to the temple. Josephus says they were induced to flock thither by the promises of a false prophet, who declared that the Almighty would there deliver them. The nearer and the darker their fate appeared, the more bright was the hope that the long-expected one would arise and save. As a last resource, the Jews betook themselves to the sacred precincts of the temple, for the double purpose of availing themselves of its defences and of preventing the pollution with which the hand or foot of an enemy would defile its sacred recesses. Perhaps they were still encouraged by the hope that though they had by their crimes and cruelties forfeited all claim for protection from their national Deity, he would still interpose to save the hallowed edifice where his chosen people had met to pay their vows and exalt his praises, and upon whose altars daily sacrifices had been offered to his glory. They may even have waited with assured confidence that he who had interposed his strong arm to overthrow the kings of Egypt and Assyria would, ere it was yet too late, come forth in the terrors of the lightning or the earthquake. It does not seem to have entered into their thoughts that the splendid structure was doomed to destruction. They trusted much, likewise, to the known dread of the enemy. The Roman soldiers hesitated to enter even the courts or the cloister. Josephus says they shuddered at it as profanation. The emperor himself, either from respect to its reputed sanctity, or admiration of its splendid magnificence, had resolved

to save it, and had issued strict orders to that effect. When he found that the Jews had betaken themselves to its protection, and that his victory could be extended and completed only by their defeat, he remonstrated with them, and promised them if they would come forth from its shelter and defend themselves the temple should go unharmed. "You have put a barrier," he said, "to prevent strangers from polluting your temple. This the Romans have always respected; we have allowed you to put to death all who violated its precincts. Yet ye defile it yourselves with blood and carnage. I call on your God, I call on my whole army, I call on the Jews who are with me, I call on yourselves, to witness that I do not force you to this crime. Come forth and fight in any other place, and no Roman shall violate your sacred edifice." The doom of the temple was sealed. The fire which destroyed it was lighted by a Roman soldier, who, when Titus had retired to rest, acting without orders, and against the express commands of the emperor, mounted upon the shoulders of one of his companions and threw a blazing torch into an open door. Even when the flames had spread around, so as to make the ruin certain, Titus rushed among them, commanding and entreating the soldiers to use every effort to stay them. But their insatiable hatred of the enemy, the ardour of battle, and their eagerness to seize the plunder, overcame their respect for the emperor; and they revelled among the splendours of the intricate and numerous apartments, till the tottering ruin of so much magnificence compelled them to retreat and leave the temple to its fate. Ten thousand Jews, men, women, and children, perished in its flames.

With this consummation, all hope of deliverance was abandoned. The Almighty had allowed the house where he had so long deigned to dwell, to be violated and destroyed; he had cast them off from his protection, and they were no longer the favourites of Heaven. But their calamities stopped not here. It seemed, for a time, that not only their existence as a nation was to be closed, but as if the very name of Jew was to be consigned to the pages of history, and numbered with the things which once were. All the remaining strongholds of the Jews, throughout the Roman empire, were attacked and demolished. Hostilities were continued long after the means and inclination for resistance were lost. If the fearful signs which portended the destruction of the city were fit presages of the downfall of the

temple, this last event may well be considered as but the beginning of those indescribable woes with which Judea was afterwards afflicted. Where mercy was asked it was never given, unless in the permission of being slaves to the meanest of the Roman people, or the necessity of being chained as labourers in the mines or galleys. The glory had departed from Israel, and had departed forever.

Thus, in all its fearful minuteness, was fulfilled the prophecy of our Saviour. As involving the destiny of those who were once the favoured people of God, it was most worthy of being pronounced by the lips of him whose day was declared before their election was made, and at whose coming the father of their race had in long prospect rejoiced. The Almighty had elected the Jews. He likewise commissioned the Saviour to fix an end to their privileges.

We are led, in conclusion, to inquire why such scenes of desolation and blood were selected as the signs of the coming of the Son of Man? Why were the national privileges of the Jews thus fearfully closed? And why was the establishment of a religion of peace made to depend upon the previous occurrence of all the atrocities of war? If we may presume to inquire into the counsels of God, Paul has undoubtedly given us the cause of the calamities which he knew were to come upon the Jews. (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.) We need not say that the Almighty brought directly upon them such direful punishments; but we may say that he did not interfere to prevent them. They were the natural consequences of their own obstinacy and hardness of heart. They had corrupted the law which had been given them, and refused to be convinced by the highest proof which the Saviour could give them of the divinity of his mission; they had slighted all his warnings, and condemned one who never harmed them to an ignominious and cruel death. They had filled up the measure of the iniquity of their fathers, and scoffed at the holiest precepts. Thus they had forfeited every claim upon the Divine protection, and richly deserved every calamity that fell upon them; for in enduring them they were but repaying that innocent blood which they had willingly brought upon themselves and their children.

It was fit, likewise, that as the hand of the Almighty had been employed in erecting the temple it should also be present at its overthrow. If a new religion was to be established under his name, it was but right that his protection should

be visibly withdrawn from the old. As long as the temple remained upon its foundation it would still be considered the place where men ought to worship; and though the continual flame might cease to burn upon its altar, the hope within their breasts would never die. Nothing but its total overthrow would have proved to them the absence of the Deity. When the violent hands of the soldiery had been permitted to pollute it, to plunder its ornaments, and even to defile with their presence the Holy of Holies, where none but the chief priest might enter, the Jews would call it an awful sacrilege. But when its walls were levelled with the ground they could say nothing to encourage themselves or each other. Such total, entire ruin was necessary, and it was permitted. The altar would no longer flame with its costly incense. Its sacred steps and pavement had been drenched with the blood of its last fearful sacrifice, and it was no longer the accepted shrine of Jehovah. Upon the very spot where he had so long been worshipped, amid the slaughtered bodies of his priests, and surrounded by the smoking ruins of the temple, the victorious Pagans offered their sacrifices of joy to "the unknown God." The golden table and candlestick, the censers, the silver trumpets, and the Book of the Law, which had been kept in the temple, were carried to Rome, to grace the triumph that Vespasian made for his son Titus. If the chief design of the Almighty, in the destruction which he permitted, had been to show that rites and ceremonies would no longer receive his approbation, the total ruin of everything upon which the ritual observances of the Jews depended, would have fully done this.

Since the destruction of Jerusalem there has not lived a man who could rightly claim the title of a Jew. The scattered remnant of the race may still meet in their synagogues, may still read the law in the original tongue, and with their faces turned to Jerusalem may pray for the redemption of Israel. But the hour has past. The Redeemer has already come. They will wait in vain for a new deliverer. The Messiah has come; and his is "the only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved."

G. E. Ellis.

The Religion of Intelligent Men.

By intelligent men I mean not simply those who have been trained up at our colleges and universities, but those also who, in the various circumstances in which they have been placed, have to a considerable degree cultivated their minds, and increased their knowledge; whose talents and attainments qualify them for important stations in society, and whose endowments and situation in life give them the power to exert a great influence on their fellow-men. By intelligent men I mean those persons in the community, who usually account themselves the more intelligent, and are accounted so by others. My object in this paper is, to consider what attention such persons more generally pay to religion; what evidence they give of an earnest and steady piety, and of a devout and Christian life.

There are some to be included in this class, who openly reject and zealously oppose Christianity, who claim the wisdom to know that all religion is but priestcraft, superstition, and folly, and that God is but the creature of imagination. Such men are engaged about religion; but it is to destroy its authority and influence. They are eager to make proselytes to their infidelity or atheism; as though belief in a God, a Providence, in a Saviour, and a future life, were the chief obstacle to human happiness.

But leaving those who are the avowed enemies to Christianity, let us speak of those who, on the whole, choose to be known as its friends. They show an outward respect for religious institutions; they may contribute to their support, they may frequently or occasionally attend public worship, they may read the Bible and religious books. But how many of them seem to be stupid about their spiritual condition, regardless of the dangers which threaten them, insensible to the worth of their souls, and to their need of preparation for death! They may speak of the evils of infidelity, the absurdity of atheism, the reasonableness of Christianity; but how many of them leave us to doubt whether they have ever felt the power or been convinced of the importance of the Gospel as a means of salvation! They like to compare opposing systems of theology, to read the arguments that can be brought for and against difficult and disputed doctrines. They love to study controversial divinity, to listen to popular and elo-

quent preachers. They love to engage in religious conversation themselves, when opinions, errors, and extravagancies are the topics of discourse. But vital, practical godliness, a religion of the heart and life, is what many of them have no relish for, nor feel any concern about. They are but little more affected by reading the Scriptures than they would be by reading the heathen mythology. The truths of the gospel make no solemn impression on their hearts; and they feel not their obligations to obey its precepts. They often in various ways give us to understand that they consider it as an act of condescension in them to regard religion. They imagine themselves too wise to submit to its instruction, and too independent to be restrained by its laws and authority. It would be cowardice in them to fear God, and disgrace to humble themselves before him, and superstition to pray to him.

How many of those who pass for the more intelligent, and who in various ways are important members of society, are men who make no pretentions to piety! Many would confess to you that they were not pious, and the confession would make them betray no apparent signs of either shame or remorse. They continue, year after year, cold and careless about their eternal welfare. How many of them treat with indifference the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper! as though no mention was made of them in the New Testament. Penitence for sin, prayer, gratitude, praise, openly professing their faith in Christ, and following his example, are duties which with all their learning they have never discovered, or they have had the boldness to disregard them. They appear to feel no anxiety about their condition and prospects. They know they are not complying with the gospel terms of pardon and salvation, and yet they continue unconcerned or fearless. Their respectable station in society and their intelligence almost cuts them off from the privilege of being admonished and instructed by those around them. The more humble and ignorant seldom venture to remind them of religion, supposing their exhortations would be fruitless, if not offensive; their minister feels not the freedom to urge them to attend to religion as he does those in humbler circumstances. He fears they will account him obtrusive, and he thinks their knowledge excuses him for his silence and neglect.

Perhaps some of my readers may sustain the character I have been attempting to describe. I will suppose that one

such, at least, will glance his eye over these pages. To such an one I would make an earnest, solemn appeal. You are an intelligent man. I will suppose your outward deportment decent and correct. You are not profane and indelicate in your language, you are not intemperate or licentious, you abstain from what the world calls vices, you pass for what is called an industrious, sober, honest, and amiable man. You are constant in your attendance on public worship. You generously and cheerfully aid in support of religious institutions. You take an active part in promoting the interests of the society to which you belong. You respect and esteem your pastor. You are earnest that what you have adopted as Christian truth should prevail and gain the ascendancy over what you call error. You love to talk about religion, to remove objections and prejudices against your views of it, and to persuade others to embrace the doctrines which you advocate. But if you are an intelligent man, you know that many who pass for such do not go so far as I have supposed you do in regard to religion. Many fall much below you, and, compared with you, treat the subject with almost total indifference and neglect. But you are not one of these. By many who have but a slight acquaintance with you, or who take a partial view of your character, you may be thought altogether a Christian even now. But can you not perceive that one may easily show your zeal and liberality, without having much love to God or a just sense of the importance of religion? You may do all this to gain popularity, and to promote your temporal interests. I cannot tell by what motives you are actuated, nor do I presume to judge or to know your heart. But I would affectionately entreat you to examine yourself, whether you be in the faith. My fear is that you are still a stranger to yourself and to religion. If you are already pious, you will know how to pardon my solicitude; and if you are not, I trust you will neither be disgusted nor grieved at my friendly expostulation. The question is not, whether you sustain what is commonly called a good moral character; but whether you are in desire, purpose, heart, and life a Christian? one who with some degree of propriety can be called a follower and disciple of Jesus? You know the meaning of the word disciple. Have you received Jesus as your teacher, your master, your Saviour, and the mediator between God and man? Have you ever felt your obligations to yield obedience to his instructions, and to submit to his authority? Have you with gratitude owned

him to be your Saviour? Have you ever felt your need of that truth, grace, and mercy, which he reveals and offers to you? Have you ever complied with those conditions on which you are promised pardon, acceptance, and eternal life? I need not tell *you* what sin is. Have you ever viewed yourself as a sinner, and exercised that repentance which the gospel requires? Something is said in Scripture about being born again, born of the spirit, and created anew in Christ Jesus. On comparing your dispositions and conduct with the requirements of the gospel, can you consider yourself as thus spiritually born and created anew? Something is said about taking up the cross, and confessing Christ before men. What sacrifices do you make; what self-denial do you practise? O, my friend, have you ever felt any godly sorrow for sin? and has that sorrow produced reformation of life, peace of conscience, and joy of heart? "If ye love me, keep my commandments," saith the Lord. Do you thus love him? You choose to be known among the friends of religion. But is it your sincere desire and constant endeavour to be acknowledged by Christ as his friend? What are your religious feelings and habits? Are you accustomed to the duties of watchfulness, prayer, reading the Scriptures, and devout meditation? Perhaps you are the master of a family, and a father. Is your house a Bethel? Are you a priest and a prophet to those under your roof, — a priest, to approach the domestic altar and offer the morning and evening sacrifice; a prophet, to read the sacred pages and to enforce their truths and precepts by earnest exhortations? You are desirous to have your views of religion spread; but what kindles that desire in your breast? What need have others of religion? How is it important to them? You desire the progress and triumph of your opinions; but is it with a view to secure the prevalence of holiness and virtue? Do you look upon your fellow-men as immortal and accountable beings; as needing the support and consolation of the gospel in this world, and its hopes and promises to render them happy in the world to come? Have you with an eye of pity regarded the moral and spiritual condition of those living in error and sin? Have you accounted religion the one thing needful to give light to the mind, joy to the heart, peace to the conscience, and rest and salvation to the soul? Have you given your heart to God; are you devoted to Christ? Have you been baptized? Have you made a profession of religion? Do you let your light shine before men?

I do not ask you to what denomination you belong. I trust you belong to none that would reject you for your having a pious heart and living a holy life.

You are an intelligent man; qualified, by your station and attainments, for rendering important services to the cause of religion and virtue. *Where much is given much will be required.* Consider what you can do by your example and influence to advance the Redeemer's kingdom.

Will you smile at my earnestness? Will you treat these inquiries and expostulations with indifference? I trust you will not. Consider how soon you must depart out of this world. I have supposed that it will be a comfort to you in a dying hour, if you can take such a retrospective view of your life as a sincere, pious, and intelligent Christian might. In this world men are often respected for their talents, their learning, their station, and their wealth. But in the world to which we are hastening, and at the tribunal before which we must appear, we shall be measured by our virtue and piety; and he will be accounted the wise man, who has had the wisdom to fear God and the understanding to depart from evil. To be known of God with approbation, to be owned by Christ in the presence of his Father and the holy angels, are honours worthy of our most ardent desires and of our most diligent endeavours. Such honours may we seek, and so seek that we shall obtain them!

J. Farr.

Salvation by Jesus.

Jesus is called our Saviour. If any one fact be clearly taught in the New Testament, it is that we are saved by him, and that, except in his name, there is, there can be, no salvation. In what sense is this true? It is an important question. I propose to answer it briefly, but as satisfactorily as I can.

If we would comprehend the New-Testament writers, we must call back the ages which have passed away since they wrote, and bring up before us, in all their freshness, the scenes in which they acted, the circumstances which formed their minds and gave to their language its peculiarities. They were men of their own times. They wrote for their contem-

poraries, and chiefly for their own countrymen. They indeed uttered grand and glorious truths, truths which belong to all ages, to all countries, to all individuals; but these truths immeasurably surpassed their comprehension. They uttered them with but a vague consciousness of their import. They saw only Jews and Gentiles. They saw only an immediate remedy, or rather a substitute for the worn-out system of Judaism, and for heathen superstition and idolatry. They never considered Christianity as a universal religion; they never thought of laying down maxims and uttering oracles for all coming ages. Hence it is, in almost every sentence of their writings, you stumble upon something local, or temporary, suggested by circumstances then existing, intended to meet objections, to obviate difficulties, which were then encountered, but which have been long since forgotten. There is in these writers a double current of thought, if I may use the expression, proceeding from two and dissimilar sources, one from their own minds, the other from God. The first is seen in the form and colouring of their language, in the local aud temporary objects to which they apparently devoted themselves; the other is seen in the sublime thought, in the universal truth, in the divine reason, which every moment breaks out in spite of themselves, in spite of all the narrowness of their views and of their Jewish prejudices. We must always bear this in mind when we read the New Testament, and be careful to distinguish what belongs to the writer, to his age, to his country, to the circumstances by which he was influenced, from what belongs to God, and equally to all ages, to all countries, to all individuals, and to all circumstances.

We will go back to Judea; we will place ourselves near the temple in the holy city, a short time before its destruction by the Roman army, where we can have a full view of the tribes as they repair thither to worship. Who are these tribes? What are their pretensions? Let us listen, a moment, to the conversation between this Jew and this believer in Christ.

Believer. The time is set. This city is soon to be numbered with those that were and are not. The temple-worship will soon cease. The institutions of Moses have had their day, and they and our nation will pass away.

Jew. Prophet evil! how darest thou utter such predictions? God hath chosen Jacob and made Israel his habitation.

Has he not sworn to be our God, to be our Protector, to be our Saviour, and has he not promised that every nation that will not obey us and submit to our law shall be destroyed?

Believer. I tell you the day of your law is ended. It is old and ready to vanish away.

Jew. Our law? God gave that law on Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses to our fathers, to be an everlasting covenant between him and his people Israel. How sayest thou that it is old and ready to vanish away?

Believer. That law is imperfect —

Jew. Hold, wretch! Thou blasphemest! The law imperfect? God himself gave it, and promised us life if we obeyed it.

Believer. No matter. Your law is imperfect. It commands sacrifices and offerings, which are of no avail. The blood of bulls and of goats cannot wash out the deep stains of sin, cannot purge the conscience and make it alive towards God and void of offence. The law enjoining sacrifices and offerings, outward rites and ceremonies, is necessarily imperfect. Its righteousness is of a low kind, and insufficient. I may repair to Jerusalem statedly, my three times a year, to worship, I may keep all the appointed fasts and feasts, make all the appointed oblations, submit to all the prescribed ablutions and penances, and still be a bad man; my heart may still meditate murder and my hands be red with crime. The thing intended by the law may be good, but to rest in its positive, external duties is death. You may keep it, but it will answer not your purpose; for by its deeds, that is by the duties which it enjoins, shall no flesh be justified.

Jew. There may be truth in this; but if we discard the law, whither shall we go? What substitute do you propose for the law of Moses?

Believer. Jesus, the Christ, in whom we should trust; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Give up Moses, and believe in Christ; abandon your law with its long, fatiguing ritual, and embrace the gospel, and be translated from the kingdom of Mosaic darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, where all is light and life.

Jew. But who is this Jesus? What concern can he have with my salvation? Or how can I find safety in him?

Believer. Your law is imperfect. Its righteousness is of a low kind. For although one should keep the whole law, we might still inquire whether he be a good or a bad man.

You want, then, a righteousness of a kind different from your legal righteousness. Your legal justice is not true moral justice. This true moral justice, spiritual righteousness, Moses did not give you. Some of the prophets beheld a few faint gleams of it, and foretold that it would be ushered in with all the glory of the noonday sun; but it was not ushered in till Jesus was born. He is the representative of the true kind of righteousness, and he has exemplified in his own life the perfection which, if you and I have it, will save us, and without which there is no salvation for us.

Jew. But why is it necessary that we should have that kind of righteousness of which Jesus is the representative?

Believer. Simply because we cannot be justified in the sight of God unless we are just, cannot be approved by him unless we are truly righteous; and there is no true justice, righteousness, or holiness, except that which Jesus had, and of which he is the representative.

Jew. It is well. But will it be enough for me to have that righteousness of Christ? May I then neglect the Mosaic law and not be guilty?

Believer. Yes. When you become a Christian, you are translated into a new order of ideas, into a new spiritual kingdom; have, as it were, a new country, and are no longer in bondage to the laws of the one you have abandoned. Your law is insufficient. Its righteousness cannot save you. Christ is all-sufficient. His righteousness, and that alone, will save you.

The mystery is solved. The apostles were Jews and combatted the Jewish religion. They were to the Jews infidels and innovators. They condemned the old law, and sought to destroy its dominion. They proposed a new system of moral righteousness, one founded on different principles, appealing to an entirely different order of ideas. Of this new system Jesus was the representative, its personification, and hence it bears his name. And, as it was only by possessing this kind of righteousness anyone could be saved, it was said, and said truly, "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

Controversy may end. We all agree as it respects Christ's righteousness. Let us be assured that we cannot be saved without it. Let us be assured we must have it, — not imputed to us, as some have wildly dreamed, — but in us, wrought out in us, by our own love and obedience. We must have

Christ's righteousness, by being righteous as he was righteous, by having in us the same mind or spirit that was in him, by being what he was, "sons of God and joint heirs with him." Then are we saved by Jesus, — not by him personally, — but because we possess that righteousness of which he is the representative. Let us all aim to obtain it, and that without delay.

O. A. Brownson.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Poems. By S. G. Bulfinch. Charleston, 1834. pp. 108. 18mo.

This little volume contains a variety of poems, written in the brief intervals of leisure in an arduous profession. Their literary merits are various; all are respectable, and some breathe a high strain of poetical feeling. They give evidence of an accomplished mind and a practised hand. The tone of moral and devotional feeling is of the purest and best kind. The language generally has an agreeable flow, and sometimes rises into truly vigorous expression. Like all literary efforts produced in moments snatched from laborious duties in another line of occupation, they sometimes betray haste in composition, languor in conception, and want of finished execution. The imperious demands of rhyme sometimes require the insertion of the weaker instead of the stronger word, the inappropriate instead of the appropriate epithet, and, in fact, the unpoetical instead of the poetical expression. Making all these deductions, much remains to gratify the taste and excite the better feelings of the reader.

A part of the volume is taken up with translations, chiefly from Schiller, one of the purest poets of modern times. The two or three from Körner are done with great spirit and fidelity to the original, and all of them show a just appreciation of German idiom, in thought and expression, and a scholarlike mastery over German poetry.

We insert the poem on "New England," as a favourable specimen of Mr. Bulfinch's powers, and the reply to it by "Ma-

rion," to show the noble spirit of patriotism that is yet unextinguished in the South.

We merely remark that the epithets in the expressions, "harp-strung lyre" and "burning-hearted youth," of "Marion," do not seem in good taste.

"NEW ENGLAND.

"Oh! who upon his lips could lay
The seal of caution strong,
And calmly give the slander way
That does his country wrong?
Who can restrain the burning word,
The fearless glance of youth,
When each indignant thought is stirred
To witness to the truth?

"New England! glorious, native land!
When false to thee I prove,
Then palsied be my faithless hand,
My lips forget to move!
When thou art challenged, shall my voice
In thy good cause forbear?
No! be a nobler part my choice,
Here,—ever,—everywhere.

"Home of the good, the brave, the wise,
Bold youth and beauty bright,
The sun, as on his course he hies,
Beholds no lovelier sight.
Italia's vales with perfume glow
From every flowery tree,
But ne'er those lovely valleys know
The breath of Liberty.

"Bright beams the sun on Syria's plains,
Where ancient prophets trod,
And held, in nature's forest fanes,
High converse with their God.
But holier are the hills that bind
Thy stormy ocean shore,
For there the sacred human mind
Knows its own strength once more.

"There, in the cottage and the hall,
As bursts the morning ray,
The hymn of praise ascends from all
To Him who gives the day.
There, as the evening sun declines,
They join in harmless glee;
On all the beam of pleasure shines,
For all alike are free.

"Yet if I love thee, native land!
Is the bright South less dear?
Can I not prize the lofty band
Of generous spirits here?

Souls warm with honour's sacred fire!
Hearts true in friendship known!
Fearless I strike the patriot lyre —
Its spirit is your own.

"At the request of a friend, the preceding lines were inserted, with the signature of 'HAROLD,' in one of the Augusta papers. The next number of the same gazette contained the following noble verses in reply.

"'TO 'HAROLD.'

"'Child of those hills whose lofty heights
Their answering thunders woke,
When, struggling for her injured rights,
Our infant nation spoke, —
Those barriers to the stormy sea,
Where men, resolving to be free,
First spurned the tyrant's yoke, —
Can Southern hearts forget that spot?
Child of those hills! believe it not.

"'Shame to the man who would forget
New-England's noble stand,
When Britain's bannered columns met
To desolate our land.
No! by the blood she freely poured, —
By Warren's spirit, — Putnam's sword, —
We love New England yet!
Those hills! that height! tomb of the brave!
Our martyred freemen's earliest grave!

"'The selfish for a time may rule,
Fierce passions bear the sway;
The traitor knave, the busy fool,
Alike may have their day: —
Our Union Banner, still, untorn,
Shall proudly on the winds be borne,
Reflecting every ray.
No! not a star our fathers set
Shall fall from that bright coronet.

"'Child of those hills! thy harp-strung lyre
Swells with a lofty strain; —
O! let its tones of patriot fire
Breathe on our souls again!
Its spirit bears a tale of truth
To every burning-hearted youth,
From mountain to the main;
Thy native hills, though cold they be,
Are peopled by the brave and free.

"'MARION.'"

pp. 70 – 74.

1. *Mr. Dunlap's Speech in the Municipal Court, in Defence of Abner Kneeland on an Indictment for Blasphemy.*
2. *Arguments of the Attorney of the Commonwealth in the Trials of Abner Kneeland for Blasphemy.*

The former of these publications was printed and circulated first, and the latter was published as an antidote to what it was feared would be its injurious effects, "at the request of some Christians of various denominations."

We are satisfied that it will prove a sufficient antidote, not only to the laboured defence of Mr. Kneeland, but also to all those poisonous mixtures of irreligion, sensuality, and ignorance which the infidels are now so busy in concocting. The most ill-humoured critic could wish for no better subject, on which to exhaust his spleen and satire, than Mr. Dunlap's Speech would afford him. It is a collection of all the unfortunate persecutions and violent controversies that disfigure the history of Christianity, —of which, it will certainly be no disparagement to Mr. Dunlap, who has chosen a different sphere in which to exercise his powers, to say, that he has evidently been a very superficial reader. We must, however, do him the justice to say, that he disapproves of all these unholy contentions; for so we construe the purpose of his attempt to free himself from the opprobrium of undertaking the defence, and the numerous flowery epithets which he bestows upon pure Christianity. Yet we must be allowed to pronounce his speech a very poor production. What it may be in a legal point of view is no concern of ours; but as a piece of connected history, of sound arguments and satisfactory demonstration, we should think it fully within the intellectual powers of the defendant himself. It would be a very easy matter to expose the sophistry of Mr. Dunlap's reasoning, where he aspires to such a thing; and, by divesting his ideas of their interminable rigmarole of repetitions, flummery, and bombast, to point out many perverted and inconsistent statements, besides several downright violations of true history. But we are happily free from the necessity of such an attempt; as the badness of the cause in which he permitted himself to labour would account for still greater deficiencies in the means necessary to support it.

Of Mr. Parker's argument we can speak in terms of unqualified approbation. We rejoice that it has been made public, both on account of the clear views which are contained in it in regard to the proper signification of religious tolerance, and the real character of that system whose advocate was on trial for blasphemy. Mr. Parker has well defined the meaning of certain terms necessary to be employed in the case, which it was the policy of the defendant's counsel to confuse and render senseless. He has shown most satisfactorily that blasphemy has a meaning,

that religious faith is not hypocrisy, and that our laws, which insure to everyone the purest freedom in holding and maintaining those views which his individual reason and conscience approve, are very far from allowing to any man the liberty of deriding the opinions of another, and by obscene and vulgar blasphemy mocking his dearest and holiest hopes.

Besides the value of Mr. Parker's publication on these points, we deem it of particular interest as setting forth the true character of the existing infidelity in our neighbourhood. We fear that people are too much inclined to look upon the infidels among us as merely indifferent to religious views and principles, instead of regarding them, as they really are, a band of ignorant and deluded, not to say immoral, men, discontented with all the existing principles upon which the social system is maintained, and eager to bring about a total change in all the institutions of society. "Blasphemy," says Mr. Parker, "is but one part of the system which Fanny Wright has introduced among us." The inevitable consquences which would ensue, were her sentiments, and those of her associates, to prevail among us, are well worthy the attention of those who are obliged to witness the progress of irreligion in our country. This pamphlet will be particularly interesting to those who live at a distance from us, but who are beginning to find among them the advocates of "Free Inquiry." We wish it could have a wide circulation in the West. We copy the closing paragraph.

"And now, Gentlemen, I leave you to do your duty. I hope I have done mine. If open, gross, palpable, and indecent blasphemy, and all the consequences of the Fanny-Wright system, — atheism, community of property, unlimited lasciviousness, adultery, and the thousand evils of infidelity, receive no check, the reproach will not fall on me. If marriages are dissolved, prostitution made easy and safe, moral and religious restraints removed, property invaded, and the foundations of society broken up, and property made common, and universal mischief and misery ensue, the fault will not lie on me. But you must answer for your part in bringing up that train of incalculable evils which may be visited on your posterity to the third and fourth generations. You must answer for it to your fellow-citizens, your wives, children, and relations, to mankind, to your country, and to your God. Look, then, with care, Gentlemen, to your great responsibility in this trial, to your duty, and to your verdict. Take care, this day, that you offend not God, nor injure man, that you violate not the law and the constitution, that your children rise not up in judgment against you, and that you avoid the maledictions of the world."

"The jury did not all agree. Eleven of them agreed on a verdict of *guilty* in ten minutes. A personal and political friend of the defendant's counsel was the dissentient juror. He did not regularly belong on that jury, and was put there by Mr. Dunlap's exertions."

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

A LETTER TO THE REV. ADIN BALLOU ON THE SUBJECT OF EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE RESTORATIONISTS AND UNITARIANS.

Harvard, May 14, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

YOUR patience must have been wearied, but I hope it has not been exhausted by my long delay. I have, hitherto, been in no favourable situation for answering your letter which appeared in "The Messenger" last July. And even now I have not the leisure and freedom from other cares which I need in order to give the various subjects introduced into your letter the attention which they deserve. But I choose rather to speak now, as well as I can, than to be silent any longer. I shall, by leave of Providence, write you a number of short letters, in reply to your very long and very friendly one. I would have accepted your kind offer, and had them published in "The Messenger"; but the editor of "The Unitarian" consenting that they should appear in his journal, I thought there was a propriety in my using that channel of communication.

I am "willing," my dear Sir, "to meet" you "in a friendly discussion of the principal points which hinder the fellowship of the Restorationists with the Unitarian denomination"; though I am but poorly qualified for such an undertaking. I shall address you with freedom and plainness, and, I hope also, in the spirit of meekness and brotherly love. But remember, I answer you as a private individual, not as the organ or representative of the denomination to which I belong. Perhaps I may put in a stronger claim to disinterestedness in treating this subject now, on account of my having the care of no parish.

I am aware that many of the clergymen of your denomination desire to have fellowship and ministerial intercourse with those who are Unitarians. I know, also, that a number of Unitarians do exchange with Restorationists. I believe that the Unitarians generally do not denounce you as infidels, nor deny you the Christian name Not a few of them agree with you in rejecting the doctrine of eternal punishment. And many, no doubt, considering the duration of future misery as not clearly defined, insist only, in their preaching, on the certainty of a future righteous retribution, thinking it the part of prudence and meekness not to be positive on either side of a question which, in their view, is not explicitly decided by Scripture. You know that the Orthodox often charge us with being not simply Restorationists, but Universalists. I suspect that, as a denomination, we are not so frequent in the language of terror and threatening, nor in denunciations of everlasting woe to the sinner, as the Orthodox are. We oftener appeal to men's hopes than to their fears. And while we endeavour to enliven the conscience and touch the heart, we strive to keep the moral and rational powers in their healthy exercise. As far as my knowledge extends, Restorationists are better satisfied with our preaching than the Orthodox are. There is also a great deal of good feeling and sympathy between the Unitarians and Restorationists. They more generally seem to exhibit toward each other pacific and charitable dispositions. But still they exist as two distinct denominations. The Unitarians have not as yet consented to adopt the creed and assume the name of the Restorationists; nor have the Restorationists given up their distinctive name and peculiar doctrine and joined themselves to the Uni-

tarian denomination. Hence, in many of our efforts to build up the cause of Christian truth and liberty, we act as two separate associations. Each gives the preference to books for religious instruction composed by those of his own denomination, and to preachers whose faith more fully accords with his own. It is a fact that we differ in doctrine; we form two distinct, organized bodies of Christians; and while these things continue, I know not that we can reasonably expect a complete union and fellowship. Many Unitarians, no doubt, consider your distinguishing doctrine an error, and are unwilling, therefore, to encourage it. The Restorationists account it a glorious and important truth, which ought to be stated and defended. Many of your denomination would be dissatisfied with a preacher who rejected and opposed the doctrine of a final restoration; and many Unitarians would be similarly affected by hearing that doctrine advocated. I presume that no Unitarian church would exclude a Restorationist, nor refuse to welcome him to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.

But you wish to be welcomed to every Unitarian pulpit as a preacher. I know, my friend, there is a disagreeable feeling awakened in the heart of one who loves religion, and desires to communicate its glad tidings and holy influences to others and to enjoy Christian intercourse with all pious persons, whenever he is denied this privilege. We have, both of us, had many trials of this kind. The Orthodox have often treated us both as strangers to religion and enemies to God. I think I have learned in the school of Christ to submit to such trials with some degree of patience. I try to remember that others have feelings, and have a right to their opinions, as well as I. I blame not the Orthodox clergyman for refusing to exchange with me, nor his society for being unwilling to hear me. If they would manifest their dissent from my faith in such ways only, I would rest satisfied.

You know it is but a few years since you separated from the Universalists and assumed the name of Restorationists. Your denomination appears to be strongly opposed to the Universalists; but many Unitarians have not yet sufficiently considered or understood what a wide difference there is between your sentiments and those of the sect from which you seceded; and, if they exchange with you, they may fear you will embrace that opportunity to indoctrinate your hearers in a faith which they deem unsound. For myself, I know not of any instance, where your ministers have done so, when they have exchanged with Unitarians. And would the two denominations mutually and generally agree on all such occasions to avoid those things about which they differed, I should have no objection to this ministerial intercourse. I have often heard Baptists preach to Pœdobaptist societies, but in every instance they were silent about their peculiarities. I should be willing to exchange with a pious minister of any sect, if his conscience would let him omit his peculiar doctrines; and unless he would, I would rather not exchange with him. I know not what you will say to this; I hope you will approve it. I have endeavoured to pursue this course myself, and have thought it proper and commendable. And it seems to me that the more this course is followed by Christians of different denominations, the more fellowship will they have with each other.

But in regard to exchanges generally, even with those of our own faith, the longer I live, the more unfavourably I think of them. They have been the occasion of much evil. No doubt good has been mixed with the evil, but I have thought that the evil preponderated. By these frequent exchanges the people become fastidious in their taste and fond of excitement and novelty. They grow discontented with their own pastor, if he is not much above mediocrity; and if he is, they are displeased with those who are not. If a society have a very popular preacher, they wish to have him exchange with none but such; if they have one of ordinary gifts, they are dissatisfied if he do not often exchange with the more talented. Many clergymen have been made to know, by the smallness of their audi-

ence when they preached at home, and the large number they were told were out when another occupied their desk, how low they stood in the estimation of their own flock. So long as a minister has the care of a society, it is important to his usefulness and their benefit that he should have their respect, confidence, and esteem. If he is faithful to his duty, he can generally edify them better than those who sustain not this near relation to them. He is better acquainted with their characters, attainments, circumstances, and wants. If he is often absent from his people on the Sabbath, many precious opportunities to confirm the wavering, to comfort the sorrowful, to direct the inquirer, to encourage the seriously disposed, and to fix or deepen good impressions are lost. If we desire the spiritual improvement of those belonging to our society, we shall strive to be with them as much as we can, to prevent their moral declension and to help them onward in the path of wisdom and virtue. Often the very day we were absent was the very day when we could have rendered an essential service to the cause of religion and to our people, had we been at home. I confess it seems strange to me that both ministers and people pay so little attention to this subject. I suspect it is partly owing to these frequent exchanges that the people have such unsettled, vague, and indistinct notions about religion, and that they remain so ignorant of the Bible. They never receive any systematic course of religious instruction. They go to meeting, from Sabbath to Sabbath, and hear many popular sermons. They approve the sentiments advanced; they admire the preacher. But there is no order, no arrangement, no clearness in their ideas of religion. The Scriptures have never been explained to them. Not a few even of the texts which they hear recited remain obscure, though the discourses were ingenious and learned. After going to church many years, they might use the confession, "I remember a mass of things, but nothing distinctively." Men need a religious education; to be taught to read and understand the Scriptures; and frequent exchanges are very apt to interfere with anything like a systematic course of religious instruction.

But you may think I am wandering from my subject. Forgive me if I often do so; since it will be done not to tire you, but to benefit some of my readers. Notwithstanding my digressions, I intend, before I close my series, to make a candid reply to the various parts of your letter. And I shall do it with the desire to promote the interests of our holy religion, and to nourish a spirit of brotherly kindness and charity. I shall studiously endeavour so to answer you, that, whatever you may think of my opinions, you may think favourably of my disposition toward you; and that others may believe that my object is to use all my power and influence in building up the pure and peaceful kingdom of the meek and lowly Jesus.

With Christian salutations, I am your friend and brother.

JONATHAN FARR.

☞ Our esteemed Correspondent in Canton will have the goodness to pardon the following errata which occurred in his article on *St. Simon*, in the last number.

Page 281,	line 10th	from the top,	for *repose*	read	*reserve.*
" 286,	" 7th		*seem*	"	*serve.*
" 289,	" 7th		*variety*	"	*unity.*